1 2 3	Laralei S. Paras, State Bar No. 203319 Rebecca M. Jackson, State Bar No. 221583 Seven Hills LLP 4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94111	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 01/10/2025 Clerk of the Court		
4	Telephone: (415) 926-7247 laralei@sevenhillsllp.com	BY: SAHAR ENAYATI Deputy Clerk		
5	rebecca@sevenhillsllp.com			
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
7	KEEP ÅMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF S	SAN FRANCISCO CGC-25-621299		
10	UNLIMITED CIVIL JURISDICTION			
11		Case No.		
12	KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL,			
13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
14		Violation of Proposition 65, The Safe		
15	EEVELLE, LLC; and DOES 1-30, inclusive, Defendants.	Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 <i>et</i> <i>seq.</i>)		
16		UNLIMITED CIVIL		
17				
18	Plaintiff KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL, acting in the public interest, alleges a cause of action against Defendants EEVELLE, LLC and DOES 1-30. INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE ACTION 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Keep America Safe and Beautiful ("KASB") in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to diisononyl phthalate ("DINP"), a toxic chemical found in and on the seats with vinyl upholstery manufactured, imported,			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	distributed, sold or offered for sale by Defendants	in the State of California.		
26	2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendants' continuing failure to warn			
27	individuals not covered by California's Occupatio	nal Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 et seq.		
28		1		
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF			

("**consumers**") they are being exposed to substances known to the State of California to cause cancer through exposures to DINP, when they purchase, use or handle Defendants' seats with vinyl upholstery.

3. Detectable levels of DINP are found in and on the seats with vinyl upholstery that Defendants manufacture, import, sell or distribute for sale to individuals throughout California.

4. Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at
Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.* ("**Proposition 65**"), it is unlawful for a person in the course
of doing business to knowingly and intentionally expose consumers in California to chemicals known
to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm, without first providing a "clear
and reasonable" health hazard warning to such individuals prior to purchase or use.

KASB contends and alleges Defendants manufacture, distribute, import, sell, and offer
 for sale, in and into California seats with vinyl upholstery ("PRODUCTS") containing DINP,
 without Proposition 65's requisite health hazard warning regarding the harms associated with
 exposures to the chemical, including, but not limited to, *Wake Replacement Boat Seats, Part# AO- WMWBSEAT-BLU*. Defendants' conduct subjects them to civil penalties for each violation,
 enjoinment as well as preliminary and permanent injunctive relief. Health & Safety Code
 § 25249.7(a) and (b).

PARTIES

Plaintiff KASB is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of California and
 proceeding in the interest of the general public, dedicated to protecting the health of California
 citizens and the environment through the elimination or reduction of toxic chemicals utilized in
 manufacturing consumer products and to increasing public awareness of those chemicals through the
 promotion of sound environmental practices and corporate responsibility. KASB is a person within
 the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(a), and it brings this action in the public interest,
 pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

26

27

18

1

2

3

4

7. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges, at all relevant times, Defendant EEVELLE, LLC ("**EEVELLE**") was and is a "person" "in the course of doing business" with ten (10) or more employees, within the meanings of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.

8. EEVELLE manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

9. Defendants DOES 1-10 ("MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS") are each a person
in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and
25249.11. MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, assemble, fabricate, and
manufacture, or each implies by its conduct that it does such for one or more of the PRODUCTS
offered for sale or use in California.

10. Defendants DOES 11-20 ("DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS") are each a person in
the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.
DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and each of them, distribute, transfer, and transport, or each
impliedly does so by its conduct, one or more of the PRODUCTS to individuals, businesses, or
retailers for sale or use in the State of California

17 11. Defendants DOES 21-30 ("RETAILER DEFENDANTS") are each a person in the
18 course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.
19 RETAILER DEFENDANTS, and each of them, by and through their conduct, offer the PRODUCTS
20 for sale to individuals in the State of California.

12. At this time, the true names of Defendants DOES 1 through 30, inclusive, are
unknown to plaintiff, who, therefore, sues said DOES Defendants by their fictitious names, pursuant
to Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, each
of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the acts and occurrences
alleged herein and the damages caused thereby. When ascertained, their true names and capacities
shall be reflected in an amended complaint.

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

13. At all times mentioned herein, EEVELLE, MANUFACTURER DEFENDANTS, DISTRIBUTOR DEFENDANTS, and RETAILER DEFENDANTS shall, hereinafter, where appropriate, be referred to collectively as the "**DEFENDANTS**."

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, allowing enforcement by any court of competent jurisdiction. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.

11 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS, based on
12 plaintiff's information and good faith belief DEFENDANTS are each a person, firm, corporation or
13 association that is a citizen of the State of California, does sufficient business in California, has
14 sufficient minimum contacts in California, and/or otherwise purposefully and intentionally avail
15 themselves of the California market through their manufacture, importation, distribution, promotion,
16 marketing or sale of PRODUCTS within the State. DEFENDANTS' purposeful availment renders
17 the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair
18 play and substantial justice.

19 16. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco, pursuant to
20 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent
21 jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, because one or more
22 instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because
23 DEFENDANTS conducted, and continue to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with
24 respect to the PRODUCTS that are the subject of this action.

REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND LAW

In 1986, the people of the State of California approved an initiative addressing the
harms caused by hazardous chemicals and declared their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to

chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." Ballot Pamp., Proposed General Law, Gen, Elec. (Nov. 4, 1986) at p.3.

18. Formally known as the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 and
codified at Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 *et seq.*, Proposition 65 states, in relevant part, "[n]o
person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a
chemical known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving a clear and reasonable
warning to such individual..."

8 19. Under the Act, a "person in the course of doing business" is defined as a business with
9 ten (10) or more employees. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(b). Businesses are prohibited from
10 exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals without first giving a "clear and reasonable" warning.
11 Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.

20. Exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals means to cause individuals to ingest,
inhale, contact via body surfaces or otherwise come into contact with a listed chemical. 27 CCR
§ 25102(i). An exposure to a hazardous chemical is defined as one that "results from a person's
acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a product..."
27 C.C.R. § 25600(h).

17 21. Under Proposition 65, persons violating the statute may be enjoined in any court of
18 competent jurisdiction and may be subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day, per violation.
19 Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.

20 22. On December 20, 2013, pursuant to Proposition 65's implementing regulations,
21 California identified and listed DINP as a chemical known to the State cause cancer. DINP became
22 subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements one year later, on December 20, 2014.
23 Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8, 25249.10(b).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

25 23. Plaintiff purchased DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS, without a warning, in California.
26 24. Plaintiff investigated and tested DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS at an accredited lab,
27 and consulted with a person with relevant and appropriate knowledge and expertise, who, after

28

24

1

reviewing the collected data and analyzing the risk of exposure to DINP, determined the PRODUCTS subject consumers in California to exposure to the listed chemical at levels requiring a warning under the statute, based on touching, handling or otherwise utilizing PRODUCTS in accordance with their reasonably foreseeable and intended usages.

25. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's attorney executed a certificate of merit, attesting there was a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action and included the factual information supporting the certificate when it served the notice on the California Attorney General's Office, as required. Health &Safety Code § 25249.7(d); Title 11 C.C.R. § 3102.

9 26. Thereafter, on October 25, 2024, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation
10 ("Notice"), together with the certificate of merit, on EEVELLE, the California Attorney General's
11 Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging, as a result of DEFENDANTS' sales
12 of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California were, and are, being exposed to DINP
13 through their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS as intended without first receiving a
14 "clear and reasonable warning," as required by Proposition 65.

15 27. After receiving plaintiff's Notice, no public enforcement agency has commenced and
16 is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against DEFENDANTS under Proposition 65 to enforce
17 the alleged violations that are the subject of the Notice.

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against All DEFENDANTS)

20 28. KASB realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, the allegations
21 set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive.

22 29. DEFENDANTS' PRODUCTS contain DINP in levels requiring a clear and reasonable
23 warning under Proposition 65.

30. DEFENDANTS know or should have known the PRODUCTS they manufacture,
import, distribute, sell, and offer for sale in California contain DINP. As a result of plaintiff's Notice,
DEFENDANTS also have actual knowledge of the presence of DINP in the PRODUCTS.

28

1 31. The PRODUCTS DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer for 2 sale in or into the State of California cause exposures to DINP, both direct and/or indirect dermal 3 contact and ingestion, through the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

32. The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and 5 continues to cause, exposures to DINP.

33. 6 DEFENDANTS know the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS 7 exposes individuals to DINP through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion.

8 34. DEFENDANTS intend that exposures to DINP from the reasonably foreseeable use of 9 the PRODUCTS will occur by their deliberate, non-accidental participation in the California 10 marketplace.

11 35. The exposures to DINP, caused by DEFENDANTS and endured by consumers and 12 other individuals in California, are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements 13 of Proposition 65.

36. 14 DEFENDANTS failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers 15 and other individuals in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DINP through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the use of the PRODUCTS as intended. 16

37. 17 Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, consumers 18 and other individuals, exposed to DINP through dermal contact and ingestion as a result of their use 19 of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANTS sold without a "clear and reasonable" health hazard 20 warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, 21 or adequate remedy at law.

38. 22 DEFENDANTS manufacture, import, distribute, sell, and offer the PRODUCTS for 23 sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, and DEFENDANTS' violations have 24 continued beyond their receipt of plaintiff's Notice. As such, DEFENDANTS' violations are 25 ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined, will continue in the future.

26

4

28

1	39. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-		
2	described acts, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, are liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500		
3	per day for each violation.		
4	40. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a)		
5	also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANTS.		
6	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
7	Wherefore, KASB prays for relief and judgment against DEFENDANTS, and each of them,		
8	as follows:		
9	1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and		
10	permanently enjoin DEFENDANTS from manufacturing, distributing, importing, marketing or		
11	otherwise offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and		
12	reasonable warning" to consumers addressing the harms associated with exposures to DINP;		
13	2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), issue preliminary		
14	and permanent injunctions mandating DEFENDANTS recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain		
15	of commerce in California that do not bear a clear and reasonable health hazard warning;		
16	3. That the Court assess civil penalties against DEFENDANTS, and each of them, in the	e	
17	amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an amount to be determined at trial;		
18	4. That the Court award plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, incurred	d	
19	herein; and		
20	5. That the Court grant any further relief as it deems just and equitable.		
21	Dated: January 10, 2025 Respectfully submitted,		
22	SEVEN HILLS LLP		
23			
24	ву:/		
25	Rebecca Jickson		
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff Keep America Safe and Beautiful		
27			
28	8		
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		